

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

BARBARA HOUSTON,	:	
	:	CIVIL ACTION NO. 08-cv-5530 (PGS)
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
v.	:	OPINION AND ORDER
	:	
WHITNEY HOUSTON, et al.,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	
	:	
	:	

This matter before the Court is a motion for reconsideration of the Court's October 20, 2010 opinion by Plaintiff, Barbara Houston.

Motions for reconsideration are governed by Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) and L. Civ. R. 7.1(l). The "extraordinary remedy" of reconsideration is "to be granted sparingly." *A.K. Stamping Co., Inc., v. Instrument Specialties Co., Inc.*, 106 F. Supp. 2d 627, 662 (D.N.J. 2000) (quoting *NL Indus., Inc., v. Commercial Union Ins. Co.*, 935 F. Supp. 513, 516 (D.N.J. 1996)). The Rule "does not contemplate a Court looking to matters which were not originally presented." *Damiano v. Sony Music Entertainment, Inc.*, 975 F. Supp. 623, 634 (D.N.J. 1996) (quoting *Florham Park Chevron, Inc., v. Chevron U.S.A., Inc.*, 680 F. Supp. 159, 162 (D.N.J. 1988)).

The Third Circuit has held that the "purpose of a motion for reconsideration is to correct manifest errors of law or fact or to present newly discovered evidence." *Harsco Corp. v. Zlotincki*, 779 F.2d 906, 909 (3d Cir. 1985), *cert. denied*, 476 U.S. 1171 (1986). "Reconsideration motions, however, may not be used to relitigate old matters, nor to raise arguments or present evidence that

could have been raised prior to the entry of judgment.” *NL Indus., Inc.*, 935 F. Supp. at 516; *See Wright, Miller & Kane, Fed. Practice and Procedure*: Civil 2d § 2810.1. Such motions will only be granted where (1) an intervening change in the law has occurred, (2) new evidence not previously available has emerged, or (3) the need to correct a clear error of law or prevent a manifest injustice arises. *See, North River Ins. Co. v. CIGNA Reinsurance Co.*, 52 F.3d 1194, 1218 (3d Cir. 1995). Because reconsideration of a judgment after its entry is an extraordinary remedy, requests pursuant to these rules are to be granted “sparingly,” *Maldonado v. Lucca*, 636 F. Supp. 621, 630 (D.N.J. 1986); and only when “dispositive factual matters or controlling decisions of law” were brought to the Court’s attention but not considered. *Pelham v. United States*, 661 F. Supp. 1063, 1065 (D.N.J. 1987). *See G-69 v. Degnan*, 748 F. Supp. 274, 275 (D.N.J. 1990).

The Plaintiff argues that I missed two facts concerning the identities of James Cinque, Esquire and Ira Rosenbloom. That is incorrect. My view was that the relationship each had with Whitney Houston and her father, John Houston, was not clearly set forth; but under any circumstances, the decision would not change. The Court does not find any new evidence or any manifest errors of law.

IT IS on this 14th day of December, 2010

ORDERED that the motion for reconsideration is denied.


PETER G. SHERIDAN, U.S.D.J.